```
1
                   BEFORE THE
             ILLINOIS COMMERCE Commission
 2
   IN THE MATTER OF:
   ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION ON)
 4 ITS OWN MOTION,
5 vs.
                                   ) Nos. 01-0488
                                       through
 6 CRYSTAL CLEAR WATER COMPANY
                                 ) 01-0492
7
                     Chicago, Illinois
                     November 21, 2002
 8
       Met, pursuant to notice, at 12:30 p.m.
   BEFORE:
10
       MS. O'CONNELL-DIAZ, Administrative Law Judge
11
   APPEARANCES:
12
       LINDENBAUM, COFFMAN, KURLANDER &
13
       BRISKY, LTD., by
       MR. MARK L. GOLDSTEIN
14
       3710 Commercial Avenue
       Nortbrook, Illinois 60062
15
            appearing for Crystal Clear Water;
      MR. JAMES WEGING
16
       160 North LaSalle Street
17
       Suite C-800
       Chicago, Illinois 60601
18
            appearing for Staff.
19
2.0
21 SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
   Rocio Garcia, CSR
22 License No. 084-004387
```

1	\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}										
2	Witnesses:	Direct Cross	Re- direct								
3	NONE	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>							
4											
5											
6											
7											
8											
9											
10		<u>E</u> <u>X</u> <u>H</u> <u>I</u> <u>B</u>	<u>I</u> <u>T</u> <u>S</u>								
11	Number	For Identif	ication	<u>-</u>	In Evidence						
12	NONE										
13											
14											
15											
16											
17											
18											
19											
20											
21											
22											

- 1 JUDE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Pursuant to the direction
- 2 of the Illinois Commerce Commission, I know call
- 3 Docket 01-0488, 01-0489 through 01-0492.
- 4 May I have the appearance for the record,
- 5 please.
- 6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: On behalf of Crystal Clear Water
- 7 Company and the other water companies of TP
- 8 Matthews, Mark L. Goldstein, 3710 Commercial Avenue,
- 9 Northbrook, Illinois 60062, (847) 564-5573.
- I would also like to add in the
- 11 appearance of Clyde Kurlander on behalf of the
- 12 aforesaid respondent water companies.
- MR. WEGING: James Weging, W-e-g-i-n-g, 160 North
- 14 LaSalle Street, Suite C-800, Chicago, Illinois
- 15 60601, (312) 793-2877, appearing on behalf of the
- 16 Commission Staff witnesses.
- 17 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: That's all the
- 18 appearances?
- 19 MR. WEGING: Yes.
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Okay. Let the record
- 21 reflect that this is a status hearing. I'm kind of
- 22 in the dark. I believe I have on my schedule that

- 1 we are moving toward hearings in this matter and on
- 2 my calendar I have them for the week of December 9th
- 3 through the 11th.
- I know the parties have been in
- 5 discussions so, Mr. Weging, maybe you could advise
- 6 me with regard to what the status and...
- 7 MR. WEGING: Well, there was a proposal on the
- 8 table to try to get that week for the -- in
- 9 completing this case. We came at -- we came at
- 10 loggerheads about scheduling the rest of this case.
- I have -- I've been in contact with --
- 12 maybe the best way to explain it is, I was pursuing
- 13 the -- trying to complete up the evidentiary
- 14 portion, via vie, the direct case that's been filed
- 15 by Illinois American. I don't think, and
- 16 Mr. Goldstein would be better able to explain this,
- 17 they don't -- I believe that the companies do not
- 18 believe that that's the appropriate way of
- 19 proceeding. So we've been just at loggerheads.
- I do have a schedule that I agreed to
- 21 with Sue Schultz from Illinois American concerning
- 22 the filing of testimony, via vie, their direct case.

- 1 That has not been actually accepted by the
- 2 respondents.
- 3 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It wasn't accepted by Illinois
- 4 American either, your schedule.
- 5 MR. WEGING: Yes, it was with no change.
- 6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I believe it wasn't. I believe
- 7 you're incorrect but that's another story.
- I think that as far as I'm concerned,
- 9 Mr. Kurlander sent out a very voluminous E-mail to
- 10 the parties setting forth what we believe are the
- 11 appropriate phases for this case.
- Obviously, we're not in agreement with
- 13 the Staff with respect to how the case should
- 14 proceed. We've proposed that the case proceed at
- 15 least on a three phase face schedule and we also
- 16 propose that we do the cross-examination of Roy King
- 17 on December 17th and we have not had any
- 18 confirmation of that proposal from anyone.
- 19 MR. WEGING: Well, I only received this yesterday
- 20 although, frankly, with the number of E-mails if
- 21 Mr. Kurlander had sent it previously it could
- 22 conceivably have gotten buried somewhere.

- 1 To explain about Roy King, Mr. King has
- 2 decided to take early retirement and we really don't
- 3 have anyone on Staff who can just -- this is not a
- 4 case where we can get another accountant to make the
- 5 same changes in a rate case. It -- this -- his
- 6 testimony is very much heavily based on his time and
- 7 involvement with these particular utilities being
- 8 out there, et cetera. So we were seeking to
- 9 preserve his testimony irrespective of what else
- 10 happens in this case.
- 11 The problem, of course, is, Well, the
- 12 17th is acceptable to us, Roy King and
- 13 Mr. Goldstein. I don't know if the ALJ is available
- 14 on that date.
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: I am available on that
- 16 date.
- 17 MR. WEGING: Because they are talking in terms of
- 18 pretty much an all day cross-examination of
- 19 Mr. King, I think.
- 20 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I would say that based upon the
- 21 fact that I'm going to do the cross-examination, I
- 22 believe that the examination will take half a day.

- 1 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, I am available that
- 2 day so given the fact that, you know, Mr. King is a
- 3 candidate for that and is, in fact, accepting the
- 4 early retirement package, you know, I think it would
- 5 a prudent thing to get that taken care of so that we
- 6 at least preserve that portion of the case.
- 7 Because, obviously, there are many facets to this
- 8 case so was Ms. Schultz -- the 17th talked --
- 9 spoke --
- 10 MR. WEGING: She --
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Is that a date that she
- 12 could live with or --
- MR. WEGING: It was one of those expectable where
- 14 she probably will not be able to make it but since
- 15 Mr. King's testimony, at this point, is directed to
- 16 the -- mostly to the -- well, it's related somewhat
- 17 to the capable public utility in that choice but
- 18 it's mostly directed to TP Matthews companies.
- 19 She didn't feel that she had to be there.
- 20 She did talk about having someone else from Illinois
- 21 American present on the 17th. Whereas when we get
- 22 to scheduling the Illinois American testimony

- 1 obviously she'd definitely want us to be there
- 2 assuming it would get further on the Illinois
- 3 American direct case.
- 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well --
- 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Okay. Well, then I think
- 6 we have an agreement then, December 17th, 9:30.
- 7 MR. WEGING: Fine.
- 8 MR. GOLDSTEIN: That's fine.
- 9 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: 9:30 or 10:00?
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Either way is fine with me.
- 11 MR. WEGING: That would be fine with me.
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Let's do it 9:30 so we can
- 13 allow enough time to complete whatever we need to
- 14 complete that day.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, I guess the next thing on
- 16 my plate would be some inquiry to Staff when their
- 17 testimony will be coming in with respect to IWC's
- 18 testimony given in this proceeding or posed.
- MR. WEGING: Well, I had sent to the parties the
- 20 suggestion that anyone seeking the final responsive
- 21 testimony to Illinois American do so by December
- 22 20th. I had suggested to Sue Schultz the rebuttal

- 1 be January 15th and she responded back that, how
- 2 about January 31st, which is acceptable to Staff.
- 3 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well --
- 4 MR. WEGING: I -- we do not have a commitment
- 5 though from the respondents on that but, of course,
- 6 then again the respondents don't actually have to
- 7 file testimony. They are a party. They have a
- 8 right to file if they want but they don't have to.
- 9 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, you know, this is a
- 10 proceeding on -- as a citation under a peculiar
- 11 section of the Public Utilities Act. And I guess we
- 12 could argue all day long as to its constitutionality
- 13 and this, that, and the other thing. But the bottom
- 14 line of it all is that somewhere along the line,
- 15 there's a high likelihood that these utilities will
- 16 be taken away from my client and I have to ensure
- 17 that he be given every opportunity for having due
- 18 process. And I think insofar as procedural due
- 19 process is concerned, I think the Staff should file
- 20 first.
- We have propounded data requests to Staff
- 22 trying to determine what their position is and most

- 1 of the time the responses are that they have no
- 2 position and they haven't set it forth yet and when
- 3 the time is right they will do so. Well, the time
- 4 is now. We'd like to know what their position is so
- 5 we can act accordingly in our case, and we have
- 6 every right to do so.
- 7 And so what I would propose is that you
- 8 should set a date for the Staff of the Commission to
- 9 file its testimony with respect to Illinois
- 10 American, give us two weeks thereafter to file
- 11 whatever we're going to file and then give Illinois
- 12 American two weeks after that to file its reply or
- 13 rebuttal.
- 14 MR. WEGING: Staff is, of course, not entirely in
- 15 agreement with that because essentially here on
- 16 these utilities are attempting to make the Staff
- 17 also responsible for Illinois American's position.
- I -- we do not believe the statute or
- 19 even due process would allow the utilities to treat
- 20 whatever position Staff may take, via vie, Illinois
- 21 American's case and then have a response to the fact
- 22 that we accept or reject parts of it or whatever,

- 1 they -- they're trying to seek to become sort of
- 2 like the final word on this, via vie, Staff's
- 3 testimony, whereas the issue is Illinois American
- 4 has set forth their testimony and position. Anyone
- 5 who wants to respond to that should respond
- 6 simultaneously and then Illinois American who has
- 7 statutory right to be -- who has the statutory
- 8 burden on their issues should have rebuttal.
- 9 The -- I mean, if --
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, isn't this exactly what I
- 11 said?
- 12 MR. WEGING: No.
- 13 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Of course --
- 14 MR. WEGING: You said --
- 15 MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- it is.
- 16 MR. WEGING: Why do you need --
- 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, I'm giving --
- 18 MR. WEGING: -- Staff's testimony?
- 19 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'm giving Illinois American the
- 20 last say on its own case and in whatever it has to
- 21 prove or not prove as part of the initial phase of
- 22 this proceeding. That's all I'm saying and we have

- 1 every right to review your testimony before we make
- 2 up our minds as to what our position is. It's not
- 3 you that's going to be loosing these utilities.
- 4 It's my client.
- 5 MR. WEGING: The issues involving Illinois
- 6 American has nothing to do with whether or not TP
- 7 Matthews looses the utility. It has to do with the
- 8 Commission choosing who takes over. Assuming the
- 9 Commission both finds for -- on the Staff's case
- 10 that the -- these utilities should be taken over and
- 11 to decides -- to accepts Staff's recommendation of
- 12 remedy that someone do so.
- 13 The fact is is that the -- these
- 14 companies do not have a veto power over what the
- 15 Commission -- who the Commission chooses to take
- 16 over if the Commission finds that these utilities
- 17 should be taken over.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: We're not asking for any kind of
- 19 veto power. All we're asking for is procedural due
- 20 process, pure and simple.
- 21 The testimony given -- posed by Illinois
- 22 American thus far is very far ranging. It covers

- 1 adequacy, inadequacy. It covers proximity. It
- 2 covers valuation. It covers all kinds of topics and
- 3 we believe -- we have a right to know what Staff's
- 4 position is since we cannot find out via data
- 5 request what their position is before we file any
- 6 further testimony in this proceeding.
- 7 MR. WEGING: Yes.
- 8 MR. GOLDSTEIN: And I think that's our right and
- 9 I'm sorry that I don't agree with Mr. Weging on this
- 10 point.
- 11 MR. WEGING: In other words -- I mean, this is
- 12 one of the kind of issues --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Is it sec- -- you have a secret
- 14 position?
- MR. WEGING: They have asked us what our
- 16 position --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Are you going to go along with
- 18 Illinois American?
- 19 MR. WEGING: Counsel, let --
- 20 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Tell us. Just tell us flat out
- 21 and then we'll go from there.
- 22 MR. WEGING: Counsel has asked us continuing

- 1 series of questions about what Staff's position --
- 2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: And you haven't answered any of
- 3 them, Jim.
- 4 MR. WEGING: Because we haven't filed testimony
- 5 on it.
- 6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: You don't have to file testimony.
- 7 You were going to file testimony November 9th. You
- 8 had a position before then.
- 9 MR. WEGING: And you didn't accept that schedule
- 10 either.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: But you had -- you have to know
- 12 what your position is.
- MR. WEGING: Why? The issue on Illinois
- 14 American's case is whether or not you are going to
- 15 take any -- put any evidence in, via vie, Illinois
- 16 American's case.
- 17 It has nothing to do with whether or not
- 18 Staff accepts, rejects or --
- 19 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It may have all -- everything in
- 20 the world to do with it. You don't know that.
- 21 MR. WEGING: And what -- why --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Put the testimony out there and

- 1 we'll just see whether it does or not. I don't know
- 2 what your testimony is. When you tell us what the
- 3 testimony is, we'll make a judgment as to what we
- 4 need to do in order to protect our interests in this
- 5 proceeding.
- 6 MR. WEGING: And let's assume for the sake of
- 7 argument, let's say that our testimony is, we agree
- 8 with a hundred percent of everything Illinois
- 9 American says, how the heck does that change what
- 10 you have to put in evidence in response to Illinois
- 11 American's --
- 12 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It may --
- 13 MR. WEGING: -- evidence?
- 14 MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- or it may not change
- 15 whatever --
- 16 MR. WEGING: In other words, you intend to attack
- 17 Staff's rather than Illinois American's evidence as
- 18 if we are the ones supporting Illinois American's
- 19 testimony --
- 20 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well --
- 21 MR. WEGING: -- and that Illinois American and
- 22 Staff are somehow joined as a party in this case.

- 1 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I don't understand the last point
- 2 at all.
- 3 Purely and simply, I think we -- I hate
- 4 to keep reiterating the same thing, that we have a
- 5 right to see Staff's position before it's our turn
- 6 to respond to it.
- 7 MR. WEGING: On testimony?
- 8 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
- 9 MR. WEGING: On testimony?
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It could be -- we could take all
- 11 kinds of avenues in --
- 12 MR. WEGING: Well, you have.
- 13 MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- responding to your position.
- 14 MR. WEGING: But it isn't our position. It's our
- 15 position, via vie, Illinois American's positions and
- 16 testimony. And we wouldn't actually be disclosing
- 17 legal position in our testimony anyway. We're just
- 18 dealing with the evidentiary portion of the case
- 19 still.
- 20 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well --
- 21 MR. WEGING: Obviously, certain --
- 22 MR. GOLDSTEIN: But --

- 1 MR. WEGING: And this will indicate certain --
- 2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: But unfortunately --
- 3 MR. WEGING: -- positions.
- 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- for all of us, the evidentiary
- 5 portion of this case deals with a lot of legal
- 6 issues and whether --
- 7 MR. WEGING: Well, they won't be solved by
- 8 evidence or hearing but only by briefing .
- 9 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Not necessarily true.
- 10 MR. WEGING: Well, can you excuse me for a
- 11 second?
- 12 (Off the record.)
- 13 MR. WEGING: Apparently Sue Schultz is trying to
- 14 get connected to us and she doesn't have the phone
- 15 number or pass code. I have it on my computer but
- 16 I'd have to go upstairs to get it for her to --
- 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.
- 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Fine.
- 19 MR. WEGING: Thank you.
- 20 (Off the record.)
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: In your absence I was
- 22 asking what these dates were. I was trying to jot

- 1 them down because you guys have been E-mailing back
- 2 and forth and I'm not --
- 3 MR. WEGING: Well --
- 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: -- to any of that so this
- 5 is --
- 6 MR. WEGING: Well, the only dates that have ever
- 7 been proposed has been proposed by Staff.
- 8 Mr. Kurlander has a suggestion about handling this
- 9 case in four parts without any particular dates
- 10 attached to it. Actually, those -- since
- 11 Mr. Goldstein is apparently willing to go ahead with
- 12 the completion of the filing of testimony, although
- 13 we're obviously in loggerheads on the one issue,
- 14 that would seem to be the way to go.
- 15 Like I said, Staff was willing to prepare
- 16 and file its testimony by December 20th. Sue
- 17 Schultz asked for January 31st, partially because
- 18 we're dealing with Christmas and New Years in
- 19 between that time.
- 20 MR. GOLDSTEIN: And in between that time, between
- 21 the 20th and the 31st, we'll be happy to file
- 22 whatever we're going to file.

- 1 MR. WEGING: Yes, but I don't know if that would
- 2 give Sue Schultz sufficient time to res- -- file
- 3 rebuttal testimony.
- 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, we'll find out them if she
- 5 hooks up. Quite frankly, if she needs more time,
- 6 we're amenable to whatever she wants.
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, then was she calling
- 8 in or what was the --
- 9 MR. WEGING: Well, she was -- my secretary was
- 10 giving her the phone number and the pass code which
- 11 is an 866 number for some reason.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Do we need all this on the
- 13 record?
- 14 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: I'm just trying to give
- 15 her some pages.
- 16 (Whereupon, a discussion
- 17 was had off the record.)
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Okay. Well there was an
- 19 attempt to hook up Ms. Schultz but our hearing was
- 20 scheduled for 12:30. It is 1:00 o'clock and we're
- 21 going to move forward.
- It seems that the parties have -- I think

- 1 I have to use that term reluctantly -- agreed on a
- 2 schedule to move forward, at least in the next month
- 3 and a half, shall we say? The schedule as such is
- 4 that December 17th, we would have a hearing that
- 5 would begin at 9:30 in the morning to have the
- 6 cross-examination of Staff Witness King.
- 7 December 20th, Staff would file
- 8 testimony. January 15th, respondent would file
- 9 testimony and January 31st, Illinois American
- 10 would --
- 11 (Interruption.)
- 12 (Off the record.)
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: January 31st would be the
- 14 Illinois American testimonial filing date.
- I think for purposes of setting this, we
- 16 are already going to continue this to the 17th and
- 17 at that point, we'll revisit what the next step
- 18 would be in this case -- cases.
- 19 Okay. Anything further?
- 20 MR. WEGING: There is one thing Staff has to
- 21 raise and that's the question of the supplemental
- 22 citation.

- 1 As you may know, Mr. King's testimony got
- 2 involved in the, I'll call the electric bill issue.
- 3 Obviously, until we know it's either up or down -- I
- 4 mean, if it's down, then we'd have to removal all
- 5 that testimony. If it's up, well, then it's in, and
- 6 if we don't have a ruling then we'll have to put it
- 7 in until we get a ruling. And, frankly, part of our
- 8 reason why it was being raised by Staff has to do
- 9 with how the matter would -- was discovered by Staff
- 10 in its discovery within this case which means that
- 11 although, obviously, it can be examined in a
- 12 separate citation proceeding, Staff will loose the
- 13 evidence and the facts of how this thing arose
- 14 within this case because Mr. King would be gone.
- 15 Obviously, I don't --
- 16 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well --
- MR. WEGING: I, you know, we propose --
- 18 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I would have to confer with my
- 19 client, Mr. Weging, but I would say that the
- 20 electric bills that are outstanding for the five
- 21 utilities are whatever they are. You can get a copy
- 22 of them as readily as anybody else. I assume that

- 1 you're in contact with the appropriate personnel at
- 2 ComEd. Get copies of the bills.
- 3 MR. WEGING: Well, we already have and have
- 4 already --
- 5 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Isn't that the best evidence of
- 6 anything?
- 7 MR. WEGING: -- and we would like to proceed in
- 8 this case rather than to have to duplicate it later
- 9 on.
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well -- but it has no bearing on
- 11 the citation that was issued in this proceeding.
- 12 MR. WEGING: Well, that's why --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Which was the --
- MR. WEGING: -- we need --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- then off shoot of --
- 16 MR. WEGING: -- a supplemental citation.
- 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- of everything else that's
- 18 going on.
- JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, I'm going to reserve
- 20 ruling on that right now.
- Okay. Then we are scheduled now for the
- 22 17th at 9:30 for Mr. King's cross-examination.

Τ	MR. G	OLDSTEIN:	Right	•					
2	JUDGE	O'CONNELL	-DIAZ:	Oka	у.	Thank	you.		
3			(Where	upon,	the	above	e-ent	itled	
4			matte	c was	con	tinue	d to	Decemb	er
5			17, 20	002 a	t 9:	30 o'	clock	a.m.)	
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									